

mpu.
Serial.
Crime.
M

ERRORS

OF

Prohibitionists

BY

JOHN MUDIE

"GOD COMMANDS US TEMPERANCE, YET POURS OUT BEFORE US, EVEN TO PROFUSENESS, ALL DESIRABLE THINGS, AND GIVES US MINDS THAT CAN WANDER BEYOND ALL LIMIT AND SATIETY. WHY, THEN, SHOULD WE AFFECT A RIGOR CONTRARY TO THE MANNER OF GOD AND OF NATURE BY ABRIDGING OR SCANTING THOSE MEANS WHICH ARE FOR THE TRIAL OF VIRTUE AND THE EXERCISE OF TRUTH."—*Milton.*

KINGSTON :

PRINTED AT THE DAILY NEWS OFFICE,
1902.

PAM

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Physiological Errors	6
Juridical Errors	10
Theological Errors	13
Milton's Views	15
Comments	16
The Wine of Scripture	16
Brief History of Prohibition	17
The Law in Massachusetts	20
Prohibition a Failure in Maine	22
Licensed Dram Shops in Maine	23
Unlicensed Grogeries in Maine	24
Paganism in Maine	27
Divorces in Maine	27
Corruption in Maine	28
Crime Caused by Prohibition	29
Dishonest Legislation	30
Self-Righteousness	33
Legalized Tyranny	34
Misrepresentations	36
Exaggerations	37
Extent of the Traffic	37
The Canadian Commissioner's Report	38
Licenses to Sell	39
Cost of Prohibition	40
Resume of Above	40
Questions for Prohibitionists	41
Proper Rule of Conduct	41
Summary of Errors	42

ERRORS

OF

Prohibitionists

BY

JOHN MUDIE

"GOD COMMANDS US TEMPERANCE, YET POURS OUT BEFORE US, EVEN TO PROFUSENESS, ALL DESIRABLE THINGS, AND GIVES US MINDS THAT CAN WANDER BEYOND ALL LIMIT AND SATIETY. WHY, THEN, SHOULD WE AFFECT A RIGOR CONTRARY TO THE MANNER OF GOD AND OF NATURE BY ABRIDGING OR SCANTING THOSE MEANS WHICH ARE FOR THE TRIAL OF VIRTUE AND THE EXERCISE OF TRUTH."—*Milton.*

KINGSTON:

PRINTED AT THE DAILY NEWS OFFICE,

1902.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

Knowledge of truth should do more good than harm. Error leads towards destruction; truth leads us to the enjoyment of the highest good. The Supreme Being is the God of truth; Christ's mission on earth, as he told Pilate, was to bear witness unto truth, a profound teacher says that the enquiry after truth, the knowledge of truth and belief in the efficacy of truth constitute the sovereign good of human nature and one of the best of poets says "Let truth and falsehood grapple, who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?" in other words, let truth have fair play and it will assert itself.

By these precepts one is encouraged to withstand prejudice and to give reasons for believing that attempts to suppress the use of intoxicating liquors by means of legislative enactments are based upon mistakes and not only fail to accomplish their object but give rise to greater evils than those they are intended to suppress.

While prohibitionists profess to act upon their motto, "Sow the state knee deep with temperance literature," they draw attention to the comparative scarcity of either spoken or written replies by claiming that those whom they assail have but little to say for themselves. There is, therefore, the less need of an apology for the following attempt to show that truth exists on the side which is opposed to their views.



PREFACE TO THIS EDITION.

The first edition of this pamphlet was published in the City of New York in the year 1889. Although it was extensively circulated throughout the United States, I believe that the accuracy of the statistics therein contained has never been denied. As those statistics, then, have received the sanction of acquiescence, I have retained some of them in this edition, but have added others of more recent date.

JOHN MUDIE.

October, 1902.

ERRORS OF PROHIBITIONISTS.

PHYSIOLOGICAL ERRORS.

The underlying error of Prohibitionists, that error upon which they build their most plausible reasons for looking to legal means for the suppression of the liquor traffic, is the view they take of the nature of intoxicating liquors, and of the effects of those liquors upon the system of the moderate drinker.

As barley and rye are food, and as the valuable qualities of these and other grains are extracted by the processes of brewing and distilling, it is reasonable to believe that the liquids into which they are converted by those processes are likewise food, and that the danger arising from the drinking of them lies, not in any pernicious quality of the liquor, but in the ease with which it may be taken to excess.

It is known that poison destroys the system, that food sustains it, and, therefore, that poison is not food; yet Prohibitionists claim, without supplying any chemical evidence in favor of their contention, that in the course of the manufacture of alcoholic, and even of fermented, liquors, such radical changes take place as to deprive those products of every food property and turn them into poisons. They try to prove this claim by referring to such instances as that a dog was killed by the injection of a large quantity of alcohol into its stomach, and that a man who drank a quart of brandy died on the spot; but such instances prove only that alcohol in excess may kill, not that it is intrinsically a poison.

Life-sustaining oxygen might as easily be proved to be a poison, for oxygen in excess is as fatal as strychnine. No one doubts that a violent disturbance of the organic functions may cause death, and it must be admitted that overdoses of alcohol may cause such disturbances, but such disturbances may be caused by over-doses of solid food and over-doses of other things, in themselves beneficial.

The argument from excess, then, is valid as to cases of excess only; it is worthless as against moderate use. Prohibitionists overlook the fact that quantitative differences produce qualitative differences*; that differences in the quantity used produce differences in

*Differences in degree produce differences in kind: ice and steam are the results of differences in degrees of the temperature of water.

the kinds of effect ; and when they say that because an excessive use of intoxicating liquor may cause death, they are justified in claiming further that the habitual use of those liquors in smaller quantities, if sufficiently prolonged, will ultimately be attended by consequences prejudicial to the human system, we may ask, on what grounds are they justified?

It must be on grounds which would justify them in saying that the poisonous character of oxygen in excessive doses is a fact established by science, and the habitual use of smaller quantities will produce the same result ; therefore refrain from breathing, for oxygen is a constituent of the air we breathe ; avoid heat, for excess of heat destroys the organism ; shrink from eating meat, for an excessive use of meat is fatal : in fact, you must not eat anything, physicians having declared that more diseases arise from overeating than from any other single cause, and what is true of excess is true in a proportionate degree of moderation. Such reasoning is absurd ; nor can they name any physician of national reputation who has ever inculcated their views on this question.* They have made, and still make, great use of a prize essay which the late Dr. W. B. Carpenter wrote many years ago on the physiology of temperance ; but the author of that work was a moderate drinker, and in the same essay there is the following statement :

“A small quantity of alcoholic liquor, diluted by the fluids already in the stomach, appears to produce only a quickening of the circulation and a temporary exaltation of the functional activity of the organ, as shown by the increase of appetite and digestive power.”

And in another essay he stated, in effect, that for people who suffer from defective nutrition a glass of bitter ale taken with the principal meal of the day does more good and less harm than any medicine the physician can prescribe.†

Prohibitionists claim the celebrated chemist Liebig, also, as an ally. They quote with triumph his statement that “As much flour or meal as can lie on the point of a table-knife is more nutritious than seven quarts of the best Bavarian beer ;” but in this instance Liebig used the word “nutritious” in reference to the nutrition of tissue and not the nutrition of nervous force.

*Sir James Paget, M.D., has pointed out that the opinions of the medical profession are, by a vast majority, in favor of moderation, as opposed to abstinence ; and Prof. Berney says that for every medical man of distinction in favor of total abstinence he can point to twenty against it.

†See *Scottish Review*, No. 1, page 24.

Let a man be hungry or weary, with but little food and a large amount of work to do, and then let him try how much assistance he would get from a pinch of meal, what assistance he would get from even one glass of beer is well known. Liebig was opposed to total abstinence, and in one of his works wrote as follows :

“As a restorative, a means of refreshment where the powers of life are exhausted, of giving animation and energy where man has to struggle with days of sorrow, as a means of correction and compensation where misproportion occurs in nutrition and the organism is deranged in its operations, and as a means of protection against transient organic disturbances, wine is surpassed by no product of nature or of art. The quantity of wine consumed on the Rhine by persons of all ages, without perceptible injury to their mental and bodily health, is hardly credible. Gout and calculous diseases are nowhere more rare than in the district of the Rhinegau. In no part of Germany are apothecaries' establishments less prosperous than in the rich cities on the Rhine, for there wine is the universal medicine of the healthy as well as the sick; it is considered as milk for the aged.”*

It is not contended that spirituous and fermented liquors contain all the necessary food constituents. The body requires nitrogen, but those liquors do not contain nitrogen,† and hence they alone cannot support life; but neither can starch nor oil, and yet each of these substances is a valuable food ingredient. Some physiologists have stated that all the alcohol imbibed passes from the system unchanged; but further and more skillful experiments have shown that only a very small quantity of alcohol imbibed remains unchanged, the greater part being burnt up in the body; and observations on people in old age or afflicted with disease, conditions which should render them peculiarly susceptible to the pernicious effects of poison, show that life can be supported for a long time on a diet which contains little but pure spirits and water, the alcohol being food.

Food may be considered under three aspects; first, it repairs the waste of tissue consequent on the wear and tear of life; secondly, it furnishes fuel for respiration, the main source of animal heat; and thirdly, under both of those heads it is the generator of force. Food, of whatever kind, is ultimately translated into force. Force, then, is the end and aim of food. Is more required to prove that alcohol is food? Are not all physiologists united in the opinion that alcohol

*Lectures on Chemistry, page 454.

†Cheese being highly nitrogenous, the English laborer wisely complements his bread and beer therewith.

gives force? One of the most eminent of consulting physicians* published a letter to the effect that

“Alcohol, as an element of diet, and when used in moderate quantity, is a highly economical force generator, a fuel that is fit to burn for the support of the system without any previous preparation by the digestive organs, and for the majority of mankind, especially for all who are engaged either in brain work or in physical work of an arduous character, particularly in such as requires quickness and concentration, its moderate and reasonable use is highly conducive to excellence and vigor.”

He stated, also,

“that a teetotaler would probably be capable of more work, or of work of better quality, if he were to consume less solid food and to make up for the deficiency by a proper quantity of alcohol, and that clergymen and others, who abstain for the sake of example, are setting an example which in reality is not a good one.”

Upon such strong testimony as we have cited in favor of the medicinal and the food qualities of beer, of wine and of alcohol it is clear: first, that those liquors are food and not poison; secondly, that use is not the same as abuse.

The ill effects of liquor drinking are caused, then, not by moderate, but by excessive indulgence. But, say Prohibitionists, the effect of alcohol is only temporary, and moderate indulgence must lead to excess.

While replying to this, it must be admitted that the effect is temporary, that moderation oils the hinges of the gate leading to excess, and that the only absolute safeguard against taking too much liquor is to take none; but, at the same time, truth requires the further admission that every kind of food is only temporary in its effects, and that to say there is any necessary connection between moderation and excess is to ignore physiology and to deny the accuracy of the experience of every moderate drinker. Men take their pint of beer or pint of wine daily for a series of years; this dose daily produces its effect; and if at any time it be increased—if thirst or society induces them to drink a quart instead of a pint,—they are at once made aware of the excess. Men drink one or two cups of tea or coffee at breakfast with unvarying regularity for a whole life-time; but who has ever felt the necessity of gradually increasing the amount to three, four or five cups? Yet we know what a stimulant tea is: we know that treble the amount of our daily consumption might induce

*The late Dr. Sir William Jenner, in London *Times* of August 14th, 1884.

paralysis. Why are we not irresistibly led to this fatal excess? The reason is physiological: the tissue consumed to-day is not the tissue consumed yesterday; the nerve particles stimulated into activity to-day will not be living to-morrow when fresh stimulus is applied. Change, incessant change, is the law of our being, fresh food renewing fresh tissue for fresh stimulus. Here, again, the distinction between moderation and excess is to be noticed. In the one case the new tissue will be similar to the old, and being similar, will exhibit similar susceptibility. In the other case there will be imperfect tissue; the original conditions of nutrition are so impaired that the organism does not manifest its former susceptibility, and to get the old amount of force one must apply an intenser stimulus. What may be truly claimed is that, although moderation does sometimes lead to excess, there is no necessity for that sequence, and that a moderate and proper use of fermented and of spirituous liquors, especially in our trying American climate, is not injurious, but, on the contrary, is beneficial.

LEGISLATIVE ERRORS.

Prohibitionists deny that good effects can attend the moderate use of intoxicating liquors, and they constantly dwell on the bad effects of excess. In every lecture they deliver, and in every pamphlet they issue, it is either declared or assumed that the liquor traffic is an unqualified evil, one which it is impossible to exaggerate, and then they claim that it is the duty of the legislature to suppress the traffic. But to tell us that an evil exists, and to show us the proper remedy for that evil, are very different things. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that liquor drinking is the evil Prohibitionists say it is, it still remains for them to show us that law can give an effectual remedy, and a remedy that would be advisable, even if it could be made effectual.* Their opinion evidently is that it is the duty of the Legislature to prohibit everything that is wrong;† but just as their views as to the effects of moderate drinking are opposed

*Prohibitionists make the mistake which logicians call the fallacy of the *ignoratio elenchi*, the fallacy which Demosthenes exposed in his reply to Æschines, when he said of an argument of that orator, *διαμαρτάνει τοῦ πράγματός* ("he misses the point; admitting what he says it does not apply to the question.")

†"Probably the jurisprudence of no civilized nation ever attempted so wide a range of duties for any of its judicial tribunals as to try to enforce natural justice."
—*Story, Equity, Juris.*, chap. 1.

by every good physiologist, so their opinion about legislative interference on this question is crude and opposed even to the elementary principles which should guide legislatures in the passing of laws.

An able jurist has said :

“It is amazing that there should be no other state of life, no other occupation, art or science in which some method of instruction is not looked upon as requisite, except only the science of legislation, the noblest and most difficult of any. In every system of law, both of ancient and modern times, in all parts of the world and in all stages of national development, the primary division of law defines the nature, functions and *limitations* of the governing authority.”*

Prohibitionists seem to have yet to learn that a man has a legal right to do many things that are morally wrong. He has a legal right to doubt the existence of God ; to indulge in hatred, envy, avarice and hypocrisy ; to believe in free love, piracy and anarchy, and to be and do many other things that are morally wrong, so long as he does no wrong to his fellow-men of which legal cognizance should be taken ; and the difficulty, frequently, is to determine at what point and to what extent law should interfere with individual liberty in order to protect the rights of the public. One guiding principle in the solution of this difficulty has been said to be the distinction between vices and crimes. A vice may be defined to be a harm done by a man to himself in the pursuit of a sensual pleasure. Gluttony and drunkenness are vices. A crime may be defined to be a wrong or an injury done intentionally by one man to the person or property of another, without just cause or excuse. Murder and theft are crimes. Vices do far more harm to the human race than crimes do. Vices are the parent of crimes, but men should not punish him who indulges in vice until he unjustifiably involves another in his wrong. When hatred shows itself in a personal assault, a punishable offence has been committed ; but mere hatred, though it incites to crime, cannot be punished. Every civilized nation legislates against crimes. No nation has ever successfully legislated against vice ; that task must be left to the conscience, under the teachings of the Church, and of social influences.†

*Blackstone's Commentaries.

†Sumptuary laws have been enacted in a number of countries without effect. Augustus attempted by enactments to restore the sanctity of domestic life. Usury laws have been tried to prevent the high rates of interest which are sometimes required by the state of the money markets. In the reign of Edward III. there was

Prohibitionists say : You legislate against theft, slavery, forgery, nuisances, brothels, betting-houses, lotteries, etc., and why should not the sale of intoxicating liquors be forbidden by law? Now, without inquiring whether some of these laws do not also infringe improperly upon the liberty of the citizen, it may be said that some of those things legislated against are crimes, and that others partake of a criminal nature through involving other people in the wrong, and further, that the question of moderation or excess is not considered respecting any of them ; that they do not become wrong after a certain point only, for good conscience indicates that they are wrong in any degree of indulgence ; but what man, with a properly constituted mind, can say that it should be made a punishable offence to drink liquor to a moderate extent or to sell a glass of ale to a person of known sobriety? Let us assume that a man is acting under the advice of his physician, or that he is hungry, weary and thirsty ; he goes into a saloon and asks for a glass of beer ; it is given to him ; he drinks it, pays for it, and departs. In this transaction did the man who supplied the liquor do an intentional injury to him who asked for it? Did the drinker of that glass of liquor do a wrongful act to him who supplied it? Was he even guilty of a vice towards himself? If not, then, in the name of justice, what right has any legislature to declare that act to be a crime which was a positive benefit to the person affected? In calling for legislative aid to carry out their Draconic ideas, Prohibitionists sanction the despotic maxim that the sovereign power can do no wrong. They forget that legislators occupy a position of trust, and that there are reciprocal duties between governors and the governed.

As it is the duty of the citizen to obey the law, so it is the duty of the governing authority to leave the purely moral duties and the vices of the individual to his own care, so long as he does not obtrude them offensively upon others, and to enact those laws only which tend to promote "the quiet, the ease and the comfort of the citizen."^{*}

enacted a statute, which ran as follows : "Whereas, through the excessive and over many meats which the people of this realm have used more than elsewhere many mischiefs have happened by which many evils have occurred to body and soul ; therefore, be it provided that in no house shall more than two meats be served at dinner or supper or more than two kinds of meat in such course." All such laws, however, have always been quietly evaded.

^{*}William Von Humboldt.

"The liberty of the citizen is to be measured not by the form of the government under which he lives, but by the paucity of the restraints it imposes upon him."—*Herbert Spencer*.

"The art of the best government consists in doing a little as may be. Apart from punishment for crime it is better for the people to be let alone."—*Lao-Tse*

"Great reforms have consisted in repealing wrong laws and placing things on the same footing as if legislators had never interfered at all."—*Buckle*.

"Please govern me as little as possible."—*Lord Bramwell*.

"With tax moneys extorted from us the government imposes upon us a state religion or a system of morals to which we object."—*M. Taine*.

John Stuart Mill says :

"There are questions relating to interference with trade which are essentially questions of liberty, such as the Maine law. The individual is not accountable to society for his actions in so far as these concern the interest of no person but himself. Advice, instruction and persuasion are the only means by which society can justifiably express its dislike or disapprobation of his conduct.

There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence, and to find that limit and maintain it against encroachment are as indispensable to a good condition of human affairs as protection against political despotism."

When the Maine law was first enacted, its supporters predicted for it such glowing success that other nations would speedily be convinced of its merits, and would adopt a like course; but so far from any people other than Anglo-Saxon Americans having yet adopted it, not one man, either in Europe or America, worthy of the name of statesman, has ever advocated that law. On the contrary, all jurists and able theologians are united in the opinion that attempts to suppress the liquor traffic are not within the proper sphere of legislation, and hence every true statesman, when the proper time arrives, must take a firm stand against such legislation, but every Prohibitionist, forsooth, knows more about the science of jurisprudence than the world's greatest statesmen do, and therefore he is bound to subordinate everything to his one object.

THEOLOGICAL ERRORS.

The strength of prohibition lies in its assumed morality, and from no other source does it derive such aid as from a host of well-meaning but ill-advised protestant clergymen, who, on this question, proclaim the doctrine, picked from the wormholes of by-gone times,

that on the questions of faith and morals men should be made good by secular laws backed by physical force, and those clergymen induce multitudes to believe that legislation against the liquor traffic is a necessary adjunct to Christianity ; and that "Prohibition is the Cause of God." It is pardonable for clerical Prohibitionists not to know what evils are, and what evils are not, within the proper sphere of legislation, for legislation is a science, and but few clergymen have* any knowledge of that science. It is less pardonable for them not to know the function of evil and the duty of the Christian respecting it. Instead of appealing to our sense of duty towards God and ourselves, to avoid drinking to excess, they say, "Abstain, for the Legislature has imposed a penalty of fifty dollars for the first offence, and imprisonment for the second." They thus exhort us to render unto Cæsar the things that are God's, a course which violates the Divine behest, and tends to destroy the springs of moral action : yet a proper consideration of the subject leads us to the belief that so far from legislative prohibition of the liquor traffic being the cause of God, that measure is in conflict with His desires on this question, and therefore must ultimately fail of success. If He had intended that temptation to do wrong should be annihilated, could he not have accomplished that object ? The same reasoning which would banish intoxicating liquors would apply to banish every kind of temptation from the world if those moralists had the power to do so, and thereby men would be reduced from their position of being like gods, knowing good and evil, to that of mere automata. So far, then, from intending that human legislation should put an end to every kind of temptation, God intended that temptation should continue to exist among men for the trial of their virtue. Possibly, no man was ever better qualified to instruct us on this theme than John Milton, the author of the immortal poem "Paradise Lost." His qualifications were founded on his earnest piety, his great abilities, and the mature consideration he gave the subject in connection with the composing of his principal poems. When the Puritans obtained power, in Cromwell's time, they tried a legislative short-cut to morality by passing a law that no book should issue from the press until its teachings were approved of by a committee appointed for that purpose. That statute seemed to

*It is this want of knowledge which has always made hierarchies so oppressive through their attempts to enforce mere moral duties, and those attempts suggest the prayer : May God protect our liberties when the clergy become our legislators

be needed then more than the prohibition of liquor is with us, for we are all sufficiently warned of the evils of intemperance ; but in those times published criticisms, reviews and notices of books were almost unknown, and therefore the purchaser of a new book might have been inoculated with its heresy or immorality before he could discover its objectionable nature ; yet Milton opposed that law in an eloquent pamphlet which he wrote for that purpose. As some of the arguments he then used are of equal applicability as against Prohibitionist legislation on the question of the liquor traffic, we give the following selections from his pamphlet :—

MILTON'S VIEWS.

“How great a virtue is temperance ! how much of moment throughout one's entire life ; yet God commits the management of so great a trust wholly to the care of every grown man. There were but little work left for preaching if law and compulsion should encroach upon those things which heretofore were governed only by exhortation. It was from within the rind of one apple tasted that the knowledge of good and evil, as two twins cleaving together, leaped forth into the world, and perhaps this is the doom that Adam fell into of knowing good and evil, that is to say, of knowing good by evil. He that can apprehend and consider vice, with all its baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better—he is the true warfaring Christian. I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised, that never seeks her adversary, but slinks away from the contest. Many there are who complain of Divine Providence for suffering Adam to transgress. Foolish tongues ! When God gave him reason He gave him freedom to choose, for reason is but choosing. We ourselves esteem not that obedience, or love, or gift which is of force ; God, therefore, left him free ; set before him a provoking object, ever almost in his eyes. It was for him to act aright ; herein consisted his merit, herein the right of his reward, the praise of his abstinence. They are not skillful considerers of human things who think to remove sin by removing the matter of sin ; for, though some part of it may for a time be withdrawn from some persons, it cannot from all. And supposing we could expel sin by these means ; look, how much we thus expel of sin so much we expel of virtue, for the matter of both of them is the same ; remove that and ye remove both alike. This justifies the high Providence of God, who, though He commands us temperance, yet pours out before us, even to profuseness, all desirable things, and gives us minds that can wander beyond all limit and satiety. Why, then, should we affect a rigor contrary to the manner of God and of nature, by abridging or scanting those means which are for the trial of virtue and the exercise of truth ? And were I the chooser, a dram of well-doing should be preferred before many times

as much the forcible hindrance of evil-doing, for God surely esteems the growth and completing of one virtuous person more than the restraint of ten vicious."*

COMMENTS.

From these principles it will be seen that morals were intended by the Supreme Being to have a domain of their own, wherein the Light that lighted every man should be his guide; that those who invade this domain with harsh legislative interference are guilty of unwarrantable usurpation; that in laboring to enforce such laws they are warring against the Divine economy; that in praying to the All-wise to make those laws successful they commit the impiety of asking Him to waive His infinite wisdom in favor of the finite wisdom of His own mortals; and that Prohibitionists should either cease from urging us to pursue the irrational course of looking to the Legislature for our reformation from the misuse of liquor, instead of the rational course of relying on our own sense of individual responsibility, or they should answer Milton's question and justify their conduct by demonstrating that their method of dealing with evil is superior to the method of God.

THE WINE OF SCRIPTURE.

It may be stated in general terms that no one ever doubted that the wine mentioned in the Scriptures were of an intoxicating kind until the origin of prohibition, and nothing has given the advocates of that measure more trouble than the devising of means for the removal of that lion from their path.

It is not likely that the Ancients ever knew how to prevent grape juice from fermenting, or if they did know, would have cared to drink such insipid stuff.

Again, it is well known that the Greek word *οἶνος* was a generic word denoting fermented liquor, that this is the word used throughout the Greek version of the New Testament, in every instance in which the translators have used the word wine in our version, and consequently it is the word used in the Greek version of St. John's narrative of the first miracle; that the Greek word *μεθύω* used in the same narrative and rendered in our version by the words "well drunk," implies intoxication; that fermented wines were at that time in common use; that there is nothing in the New Testament prohibiting the moderate use of wine, but the contrary, as in the case of

*See Milton's "Areopagitica."

St. Paul's recommendation of it to Timothy ; that Christ did not consider the use of fermented wine to be wrong, otherwise "He who was without *guile*" would not have lent himself to the semblance of wrong-doing by making wine for festivity, by using wine as a beverage, and by consecrating wine as a sacrament to be celebrated by Christians throughout all ages without giving it to be clearly understood that such wines were not of an intoxicating kind.

Now, when in the face of all this some Prohibitionists can say that "there is not a shred of evidence to show that the wine made by our Saviour contained alcohol, or that He sanctioned the use of that kind of wine," we are driven to say of them that on this question, at least, they are proof against reason.

Other Prohibitionists say :

"We admit that Christ sanctioned the use of intoxicating wine when on earth ; but if he were on earth now and saw the evil effects of drink he would approve of our efforts to put an end to the evil by legislation."

We submit that the effect of this contention is simply to deny the divine prescience and to give color to the infidels'* assertion that "every man makes his own God. With them Christ is not the same yesterday, to-day and forever ; but changing with changed times becomes a Prohibitionist and would appeal to legal force on a question of morals.

BRIEF HISTORY OF PROHIBITION.

If attempts to suppress the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors could be made successful in any place, that place should be found in the United States, where it is a fundamental democratic doctrine that the majority have a right to rule the minority, and where universal suffrage and the lack of any great national grievance requiring removal stimulate active minds to search for subjects on which to legislate. Intemperance in the use of liquors seemed to be peculiarly adapted for reform by legislative means. It was undeniable that there were cases in which liquor drinking was an evil. It also seemed clear that if men could not get liquor they could not get drunk, and that if a law were passed prohibiting the manufacture and the sale of liquor, and if such a law were vigilantly enforced, it would necessarily succeed in working a reform.

*Voltaire,

It was believed to be a Christian duty to commence and support such a movement. At first only a few advocated Prohibition, but these few became thoroughly versed in the subject, or, at least, in their view of it. They were ready with all the arguments, whether real or fallacious, which told in their own favor. They devoted themselves to the work, and, after an agitation which lasted ten years the State of Maine passed a Prohibitory law in June, 1851.

The example set by Maine arrested attention far and wide. To millions of people it seemed both possible and desirable to make men temperate by acts of the Legislature. Eloquent arguments were multiplied in favor of the attempt, and few arguments were urged against it. In the year 1852 similar laws were passed by the Legislatures of the Province of New Brunswick and the States of Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont and Minnesota. In 1853 the Act was passed by the State of Michigan, and in 1854 similar laws were passed by the Legislatures of the States of New Hampshire, Maryland, Ohio, Connecticut and New York. The late Horatio Seymour, who was then Governor of the State of New York, vetoed the measure, but in the same year he was defeated by another candidate who was favorable to Prohibition, and the Legislature of that State having again passed the Act, it became law in 1855. The States of Delaware, Iowa, Indiana and Wisconsin shortly afterward adopted the Act.

The following account, taken from Mr. Chubb's Maine Liquor Law (New York, 1856,) shows the position of the States and Territories respecting the law in that year :

States where a Prohibitory law is in operation	14
Territories	4
States and Districts where majorities are in favor of the law, but where it has not been fully enacted	5
	23
Thirteen States and four Territories not yet known to be in favor of Prohibition	17
Majority of States and Territories in favor	6
	Population. Male Adults. Area Sq. Miles.
Prohibition States	13,522,297 3,641,571 808,000
States not declared on the subject ..	9,577,281 1,499,365 656,105
Excess in favor of Prohibition.....	3,945,016 2,142,206 151,895

The earnestness with which the supporters of the law labored in the various States to make it successful in suppressing the liquor traffic has seldom, if ever, been surpassed in any movement.

Citizens vied with each other in devising means for aiding and supplementing the executive officers who were appointed by law. Throughout some States voluntary committees of three or more were selected from among the residents of every school section whose duty it was to see that the law was properly enforced within their respective districts. In other States the assessment rolls were taken, and a voluntary tax was self-imposed by and upon those who were favorable to the law, for the purpose of obtaining funds with which to secure a thorough enforcement. In Vermont, and subsequently in other States, what is called a disclosure clause was inserted in the Act, which directed that any person found intoxicated might be imprisoned and be kept in prison until he divulged the name of the man who supplied him with the liquor. Detectives were employed to discover and secure the punishment of violators of the Act. The powerful influence of the pulpit, the prayer-meeting, the house-to-house visitation, societies, lodges, Maine-law orators and temperance literature were combined throughout the country to arouse the people to the enthusiastic support of the law and to discourage its opponents.

Glowing accounts were given by Prohibitionists of the success of the Act wherever it was in force. They claimed that it caused an increased attendance at church, a better observance of the Sabbath, a lessening of crime, a greater activity in trade, and an improvement of public health and prosperity. On the other hand, they declared, truly enough, that the passage of the law was not a treaty of peace, but a declaration of war. If any man in office ventured to differ from them, they flooded the State with invectives against him. Within a few months after Governor Seymour had vetoed the Act, one Prohibitionist establishment published no less than three thousand eight hundred different "Strictures" upon him for what he had done, and many of these strictures were of a violent kind. The various epithets with which party warfare abounds were intensified and showered upon him from all parts of the State.

Under the wrought-up excitement, zeal became with many an unreasoning fanaticism. Physical force was employed. Vigilance committees entered houses at times to destroy the side-board bars, as the domestic liquor supplies were called. The jails became filled as they had never been filled before. Every means that human ingenuity could suggest were tried, but tried in vain. Violations continued with discouraging frequency; many Prohibitionists became re-

luctant to aid in enforcing the Act, and it then became apparent that the law was even outwardly observed only so long as the people actively supported it.

In many of those places where most strenuous efforts had been made to enforce the law, it eventually became such a dead letter, that, judging from the drinking habits of the people, one would not have seen reason to believe it had any existence on the statute books. Public sentiment respecting it gradually changed, until, as the result, it was repealed in four-fifths of the States which had adopted it—namely, New York, Maryland, Ohio, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Minnesota, Massachusetts, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin and Rhode Island,—leaving only the three comparatively small, unimportant and non-progressive States of Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire as Prohibition States. An account of the decline of the agitation would be instructive, but we must limit our references to the position of the liquor traffic in a few States after many years' experience under the law.

THE LAW IN MASSACHUSETTS.

In the State of Massachusetts the Maine law was tried under peculiarly favorable circumstances. That State being bounded on the southeast by the Atlantic Ocean, was bounded in all other directions by a cluster of other Prohibition States, so that she was almost isolated against the introduction of liquors (except in quantities of not less than five gallons or in unbroken packages, which quantities, under Federal authority, were allowed to be imported into any State. notwithstanding the Maine law was in force under the laws of that State); the citizens of Massachusetts deserve credit for the general diffusion of education, of public spirit and of temperance principles. The State enacted the law in 1852. Fifteen years afterwards the evil effects of Prohibitory legislation became so marked that a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives was appointed to inquire into the subject and report. The committee sent invitations to the leading citizens of Massachusetts to come before it and testify to the working of the law in their respective localities. In response to the invitations, 183 prominent citizens went before the committee; of this number, 108 condemned the Prohibition law in the strongest terms. Among those who gave evidence against the law were thirty-four ministers of the Gospel, all of whom, with rare unanimity, testified to the increased drunkenness it had caused

in their respective parishes. In the language of several of these clergymen, the effect of the law had been

“greatly to increase home-drinking and to introduce the tippling habit to the notice of wives and children.”

The Rev. James A. Healy, pastor of a very large Catholic church, who visited extensively among the poorer classes, said,

“In almost every house they have liquor, and in many places they sell to others.”

Among the most prominent witnesses were gentlemen who, from their daily experience during many years, were induced to come forward and testify to the evil effects of Prohibitory legislation. Mayor Norcross stated that “drunkenness increases;” ex-Mayor Lincoln said that “the sale of ardent spirits had increased in a greater ratio than the population had increased.” From the cities of Boston, Cambridge, Lowell, Charlestown, New Bedford, Fall River, Worcester, Lynn, Springfield and Pittsfield came similar evidence given by Mayors, ex-Mayors and other competent persons. The report which this committee made gave statistics showing the tendency to an increase of drunkenness under the Prohibitory law.

Referring to the liquor traffic of Boston, it said :

“It can be safely asserted that, while the number of open places has undoubtedly been somewhat diminished, all the principal hotels, groceries, restaurants, apothecaries and wholesale liquor dealers sell openly, and immense and continually increasing numbers of secret places and clubs have been established; drunkenness has increased almost in direct ratio with the closing of public places, and there is now more of it than at any previous time in the history of the city.”

And dealing with general principles, the report states :

“The mere fact that the law tries to prevent men from drinking arouses in many of them the determination to drink. The fact that the place is secret takes away the restraint which in more public and respectable places would keep them within temperate bounds; the fact that the business is contraband and liable to interruption, and that its gains are hazardous, tends to drive honest men from it and to leave it under the control of dishonest men, who will not scruple to poison the community with vile adulteration. Let the law cease to attempt to interfere arbitrarily with what a man shall drink, while nevertheless placing such regulations as experience has shown to be necessary over the persons who may make the sale and the time and the place where the sale shall be made. Let it be regarded as a fact that the demand on the part of those who desire, wisely or unwisely, to use liquor as a beverage has always been met and always will be met by men who will sell either under the law or in defiance of the law, and that wise legislation should recognize and act upon this fact.”

The report closed with the following words :

“As good citizens, whose only interest is to promote the highest good of the State, we should not be deterred by prejudice, or the pride of opinion, or the mistaken judgments of good men, from reforming in season a law unsound in theory and bad in practice.”*

Massachusetts did not act upon the report hastily. Seven more years passed before the Act was repealed ; but when it was repealed the value of the information contained in the report was more clearly seen. for in the city of Boston alone the arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct during the years of Prohibition had averaged about 18,000 per annum, while under the subsequent license law, although the population of the city had largely increased, the average did not rise above 14,000 per annum ; and from a report made to the Governor of the State for the year ending with November, 1878, we learn that the arrests for drunkenness in the entire State of Massachusetts during the year 1874 (which was the last year under Prohibition) numbered 28,044 ; and in 1878, with the license law in force, the number was reduced to 20,659. Such are the facts taught by Prohibition in the State of Massachusetts, where it existed for twenty long years.

“Under the constant pressure of Prohibitionists the question was again submitted to a popular vote in that State in the year 1889. Six presidents of colleges situated in the State spoke against it, eighty-eight clergymen and one hundred and twenty-seven physicians of Boston published protests against it. Opposed by the intelligence of the State the hydra was effectively crushed by the heavy adverse majority of 46,000 votes that was cast against it.”

PROHIBITION A FAILURE IN MAINE.

What success has Prohibition achieved in the State of Maine, which Prohibitionists claim to be the successful test State ? A satisfactory answer to this question requires a knowledge of the mischief caused by the drinking habits which prevailed in that State before the Prohibitory law came into force and of the extent of the mischief caused by those habits as they prevail there at the present time.

No part of the Union was more temperate previous to the passage of the Prohibitory law than the State of Maine was, except among her lumbermen. The fact that she was the pioneer State in

*In Switzerland the quantity of intoxicating liquors drunk, in proportion to population, is enormous, yet a committee appointed by the federal legislature to consider a remedy reported against the closing of the saloons for reasons similar to the above.

legislative Prohibition shows that her citizens were devoted to what they believed to be temperance principles. Even seventy-five years ago a great number of total abstinence societies existed in Maine.

The facilities for getting liquor, and the actual buying and drinking of it, in Maine, are greater at the present time than they were before the Act came into force. At one fell stroke the so-called Prohibitory law blighted every temperance society, and planted instead a local liquor agency in every town, willing or unwilling, throughout the State. The extent to which some of these agencies dispense liquor was shown at a convention of Prohibitionists held early in 1886 at the town of Saco, in Maine, when statistics were produced showing that, with a population of 6,389, as many as 16,000 prescriptions of liquor had been put up at the local liquor agency of that town during a period of two hundred days.

Besides these local liquor agencies, which are established under the authority of the law, and of which there are at present twenty-five throughout the State, there exists in violation of the law a large number of

LICENSED DRAM SHOPS.

The entire number of places throughout the State of Maine licensed to sell intoxicating liquors during the fiscal year which ended on the 30th day of June, 1901, was 1,479; as this statement that there were licensed places in a State where, theoretically, no intoxicating liquors are allowed to be sold seems so extraordinary as to call for an explanation, the following particulars are given:—

“By the Revised Statutes of the United States provision is made for taxing those who are engaged in the sale of liquor. Every person engaged in selling liquor must register with the collector of his district his name, place of residence, and the place where such business is carried on. He must pay the fee of \$20 for the stamp allowing him to sell malt liquors only, or \$25 for the stamp allowing him to sell spirituous and malt liquors. Every collector must keep in a proper place in his office for public inspection an alphabetical list of the names of all persons who have paid him the tax, and stating the time when and the place of business for which it was paid. Every person who sells liquor without having paid the tax is liable to a penalty of not less than \$1,000 and not more than \$5,000, and to be imprisoned for a period of not less than six months nor more than two years. Druggists who use liquors in the compounding and manufacture of medicine only, need not pay the tax. It is further provided that “the payment of this tax shall not be held to exempt any person from any penalty or punishment provided by the laws of

any State for carrying on the business within such State, or authorize the commencement or continuance of such business contrary to the laws of such State or of any place where it is prohibited by municipal law."

The list for the year ending 30th June, 1901, shows that there were in Maine 1479 licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and with twenty-five local liquor agencies the total number was 1,504, making one such place for every 446 inhabitants of that State.

UNLICENSED GROGGERIES.

It is seen in the extract from the statute we have quoted that the only object the vendor of liquor secures in paying the Government tax is immunity from the heavy penalties provided against selling without having paid that tax; but if a liquor seller pays the tax, he publishes that fact, together with his name and place of business, thereby exposing himself in a Prohibitory State to detection and punishment under the State law. To avoid Scylla he must risk the danger of Charybdis. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that many of those who sell liquor in Prohibition States do so without paying the tax, and trust to their own vigilance to avoid detection, and thus escape the penalties imposed by both the Federal and State laws. A liquor seller knows that by paying the tax he exposes himself to conviction under the State laws; he knows also that if he is detected by the Federal officers in selling without having paid the tax he can then compromise the matter by paying the tax and a small sum for costs, therefore many sell liquor without having paid the tax.

Citizens of Portland and of Cumberland County, in which it is situated, paid for only 258 stamps in the year 1884, although it has been estimated that during the same year there were three hundred places in Portland alone in which intoxicating liquors were sold. Assuming that the number of unlicensed places in Maine equals the number that is licensed, we find that over and above the number of local liquor agencies, there is an average of one such place for every 250 persons throughout the State.

The statistical number of licenses in Ontario for the year 1900 was 3,008, one to every 730 citizens, being a very much less ratio than Maine has.

The late Dr. Dio Lewis said:

"It has frequently been claimed that the rum traffic is practically

dead in the State of Maine. I went to examine. I found many proofs that the drink curse in that State is enormous. I became satisfied that, as temptations, the private drinking clubs and other means of obtaining liquor in Maine are more fascinating and mischievous than the open saloons."

To show the difficulty of suppressing illicit sales we give the following extract from a letter which was written in Maine by a friend of temperance, and was published in the *New York Daily Herald* of March 21, 1885. The accuracy of the statements contained in this extract has not been denied; on the contrary, it was corroborated by Gail Hamilton in an article published in the *North American Review* of July, 1885:

"For the past six years the city of Bangor has practically enjoyed free rum. There are over one hundred places there where liquors are sold, and no attempt has been made during that time to enforce the law. The law is a nullity in that city. In Lewiston, Bath, Augusta and other cities no difficulty is experienced by those who want to get liquor. In the city of Portland, under General Dow's own eyes, the liquor traffic flourishes. To illustrate how hard it is to break up the business, we may state that for five years the Prohibitionists pursued a rum-seller in Portland. They made him pay fines more than forty times, and then they got him in gaol; but this did not break up his business, for his brother took charge of it. Then they went at him; and when, after a protracted siege, he was forced to retire, his brother-in-law took his place, and carries on the business to-day. Last year there were nearly one thousand prosecutions of liquor dealers in the State, and although there were numerous convictions, the number of grog-shops was not diminished. The situation does not show that Maine is the Prohibition State she is represented to be."

The platform adopted by the Prohibition State Convention of Maine in June, 1886, says:

"In Portland, Bangor, Biddeford, Lewiston, Bath, Hallowell, and other cities and towns of the State, so far from the impartial enforcement of the law being adhered to from principle, the law is enforced or not as the personal will of the officer or party exigencies demand."

In no part of the Union have more earnest and persistent efforts been made to enforce the Act. General Dow resided in Portland, and there superintended the working of the law ever since it was originally enacted, yet in no city of the same size throughout the Union is drunkenness more prevalent. In the year 1883 this city of 33,810 inhabitants had 1,428 arrests for drunkenness, making one arrest to

every twenty-four of her 33,810, although the city of Chicago, with her 600,000 inhabitants and her bad reputation for drunkenness, had during the same year only about 18,000 arrests for that offence, making one arrest to every thirty-three of her 600,000. For the year 1893 Portland had one arrest for drunkenness to every twenty-five of its citizens. During the same year not one of Canada's nineteen cities had more than one such arrest to every forty of its citizens.

Lest it be thought that it was on account of the extraordinary vigilance of the Prohibitionists so many were arrested, we give the following extract from an address delivered in Portland by the Rev. Dr. McKeown of that city. He said :

"He thought the city was in a bad way, that it was under the rule of rum, and that the marshal's order to the effect that the law against liquor selling should be executed against those who sold on Sundays and after ten o'clock at night on other days was virtually saying that the law might be violated with impunity at other times. It seemed to him that arrests for the violation of the law had well-nigh ceased to be made by the police. He asked whether, when drunkards were reeling through our streets and intemperance swept the city, if the church should be silent."

During the summer of 1886 the clergymen of Portland petitioned the council of that city to compel the saloons to close their bars on Sundays. Such is the condition of the temperance cause in the city which was and always had been the home of the author and Commanding-General of Prohibition.

About the same time that this petition was presented, the Prohibition candidate for the governorship of Maine said in his speech accepting his nomination :

"It is high time that something should be done in this State to put down the liquor traffic."

And in supporting this candidate, General Dow said :

"The volume of the liquor traffic has not been at all reduced within the last twenty years. In every city in Maine, except Portland, the law has been and is absolutely ignored."

A volume of similar evidence might be furnished ; but enough has been given to show that, although Maine was a temperate State before the prohibitory law was enacted, it has since that time become a more intemperate State.

PAGANISM IN MAINE.

Prohibitionists claim that their law banishes drunkenness, crime and poverty and promotes happiness both spiritual and temporal, but the historical facts are against that claim on all of those points.

To know what influence that law has upon the welfare of a State we must know what it has done for the individual families of that State.

In the twenty-nine years, from 1851 to 1880, the attendance at the schools in Maine declined more than 21,000, although the population somewhat increased during that time.

In an article in *The Forum* for June, 1892, on "Impending Paganism," written by President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, Maine, it is stated that "Statistics recently gathered by the Maine Bible Society" show that Waldo county, Maine, has 6,987 families; of this number 4,850 families report themselves as not attending any church.

Oxford county contains 7,288 families, of which 4,577 report that they do not attend any church. There are sixteen counties in Maine. The combined statistics of fifteen counties show that of 133,445 families 67,842 (more than one-half) do not attend any church.

From these facts it is seen that the spiritual condition of the families of Maine does not speak well for prohibition, nor does their temporal condition.

DIVORCES IN MAINE.

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey." when the parents of the family become a house divided against itself, and in that respect Maine has a very bad record. Between the years 1867 and 1886 there were 8,412 divorces granted in the State of Maine, and in 960 cases of that number "Habitual Drunkenness" was either the sole ground or one of the grounds of the application.

According to the United States census for the ten years previous to 1880 the prohibitionist State of New Hampshire had the proportion of one divorce to every ninth marriage, being the highest ratio of any State in the Union, but according to the United States census for the ten years previous to 1890 Maine outdid New Hampshire and every other State of the Union by having the high proportion of one decree of divorce to every eighth marriage. Catholics number nearly twenty-five per cent. of the population, and whatever provocations they may have very few applications for divorce are made by them.

If they had applied as freely as the Protestants did the ratio of divorces to marriages would have been still greater than it was, and when it is considered that there was a large number of unsuccessful applications for divorce the unhappiness existing in the homes of Maine is frightful to contemplate.

CORRUPTION IN MAINE.

Neil Dow testified before the Canadian Royal Commission that the Republican party (which has been dominant in Maine for many years) made this law a political football. That the democratic party was opposed to Prohibition and always had been and that he had nothing to expect from either party. Continuing he said :

"On the platform I very often refer to the action of the two parties. I say that the Democrats like whiskey and go for whiskey honestly and openly and that the Republicans profess not to believe in whiskey, but they are in favour of whiskey all the same. The state of things existing here is very demoralizing. Some of the judges ignore the law which tends to lead the whole people of the State to illegality. They manage these rum cases in a very scandalous way."

He then said that a man had been convicted eight different times without being either fined or imprisoned once. (1)

The Honourable Charles F. Libby, ex-President of the State Senate, ex-Mayor of Portland, and for five years prosecuting attorney of Maine, said :

"This liquor law opens such an avenue for bribes that it tends greatly to corruption. There is an enormous amount of crime and perjury and every thing of that kind committed here in the name of temperance." (2)

Another witness said :

"The prohibitory law has lowered the standard of truth in Maine." (3)

An eminent clergyman said :

"The prohibitory law corrupts officials from high to low. Every sheriff and official connected with it whom I have known has accepted bribes. The men selling liquor were levied on for bribes and paid so much a week or month." (4)

(1) See last volume of Royal Commission Report, pages 329 and 355. How Neil Dow could condemn the results of his law as he did in his evidence and yet not agitate for the repeal of that law is a mystery.

(2) Pages 318 and 325 same volume.

(3) Page 325 same volume.

(4) Page 320 of same volume.

CRIME CAUSED BY PROHIBITION.

It is said that during the early ages music and poetry were introduced among some of the fierce Grecian tribes for the purpose of taming their savage breasts, and that those refining branches of education had the desired effect. Is it not reasonable, then, to suppose that the discord caused by an unjust and tyrannical law, which for its enforcement necessitates and fosters espionage, deception, social hypocrisy and unchristian bitterness throughout the State should school the people in crime? The records of the State of Maine answer this question in the affirmative. Irrespective of the liquor traffic, the number of crimes in that State should have gradually decreased during the past thirty-six years, because the floating and comparatively lawless population of lumbermen has decreased, boundary lines have become settled, neighbors are better acquainted with each other, and can better afford to waive their legal rights without litigation. Yet in Maine, during the 24 years next before the passing of the Prohibitory law—that is from 1827 to 1851,—there were only 2,026 persons committed to the State Penitentiary, or an average of 81 for each year. The record for the next 30 years—that is, from 1852 to 1882—shows that under Prohibition the large number or 4,157 persons were committed to the same penitentiary, or an average of 134 for each year (5). During these 30 years the population had increased only one-third of one per cent. per year. During the same 30 years criminal acts of a heinous nature had increased over 200 per cent. This increase of crimes, especially crimes of the most serious nature, arrested the attention of the State Legislature, and the death penalty (which had previously been abolished) was re-imposed in 1882 with the expectation that the crime of murder would be checked; but the re-imposition of the penalty failed in its object, for the Attorney-General of that State, in his report for the year, 1884 stated :

“The convictions for murder in the first degree during the year 1884 are in excess of previous years.”

During that year 14 men and women had been engaged in murdering their fellow-citizens, and some of these murders were the most inexcusable of any committed in any State in the Union. The report of the Prison Inspectors of Maine for 1884 states :

(5) In the year 1893 the number of prisoners in jail in Maine was 0.86 per 1,000; in the same year the number in the jails of Ontario was only 0.37, not one half as many. Page 341 same volume.

“According to the records of the prisons and jails of our State, it will be seen that a large amount of crime has been committed within the State during the year. Many theories prevail as to the cause of crime. We write from personal observation that the principal cause of crime is lack of good home influence and education.”

This lack of good home influence in Maine, I say, comes of the reliance her citizens have long placed on the broken reed of external enactments ; of looking to the Legislature to do for them what every man ought to do for himself ; of letting the fear of harsh legal measures supplant the pleasure-giving and refining sources of moral action, and thereby destroying domestic and social happiness, blunting the mental preception of right and wrong and brutalizing the people. If Prohibitionists refuse to except this explanation as a solution of the the difficulty of accounting for the increase of paganism, of divorces and of crimes in Maine, we submit that they are thrown into a dilemma, for then they must admit either that liquor drinking does not instigate from three-fourths to nine-tenths of all kinds of wickedness, as they have hitherto asserted, or they must admit that the increase of demoralization is caused by the increase of liquor drinking in that Prohibition State.

DISHONEST LEGISLATION.

Every agitation for the supression of the liquor traffic is supported by numbers of men who have the reputation of being honest, who would scorn to lay a finger on the property of others for their own purposes, and yet actively support the passing and enforcing of a law which deprives many citizens of their occupations and destroys the value of their property without providing any compensatton for their losses, With us the time is out of joint on this question. When a local option or permissive bill was before the British Parliament, that honest Quaker, John Bright, opposed it, and subsequently, at a temperance gathering, he gave the following as the reasons for his opposition :—

“In the cities of Manchester and Birmingham, for instance, there are about 4,000 houses connected with the sale of intoxicating drinks. I may say, without being perfectly accurate, that these 4,000 houses are occupied by something like 4,000 persons and families, but in the bill which was before Parliament there was no consideration of the interests of those 4,000 families, there was no valuation provided for, there was no compensation offered or suggested, the plan was too much of what you might call root-and-branch reform. The publicans and licensed victualers, where-

ever you got a majority, were to be exterminated as if they were vermin. Now, I don't think a policy of this kind in any country—I am sure not in this country when it is fairly examined—will be thought to be statesmanlike or just. I am against dealing with a question of this nature, affecting the interest of so many people, by what may be called a whirlwind on a calm day, or by conduct that is fit only for a revolution. I should like to deal with it in a more just and what I call a more statesmanlike, manner, according to the legislation that becomes an intelligent people in a tranquil time. Well, now, these are grounds which presented themselves to my mind so strongly that, while wishing success to all reasonable efforts for promoting temperance, I was unable to support that bill."

To what extent have we acted upon a like sense of justice? Of the many states that have enacted prohibitory laws, and of the many provinces where local option has prevailed, not one has ever made the slightest provision for giving compensation.

This flagrant conduct Prohibitionists try to justify by various untenable arguments. They say they carry the law by a majority, and the majority must rule. But it may be answered that there are rights, such as rights of life and limb, the rights of conscience and of liberty, which no majority, however great it may be, has a right to invade without a just cause for so doing, nor, in the case of property, without making good the loss.

They say the rights of the individual must give way to the rights of society. But society is composed of individuals, and if one man's property can be rendered valueless without compensation, through a law enacted by his fellow-citizens on the pretext of the good of society, another man's property could also be rendered valueless on a similar pretext, and the question might ultimately arise as to what man's property is safe from socialistic and anarchial principles.

They say :

"We have not enacted the law without giving fair warning ; those engaged in the liquor trade have known for years what they might expect, and they should have gone out of the business long ago."

But it may be asked : Are people to govern themselves by what may or may not occur on the supposition that there is no doubt that it will occur, and could they, even if they knew that Prohibition would take place, have taken to some other occupation, or adapted their property to any other business without great loss? What would be thought of the defence of socialists and anarchists if they were to say :

"Land owners and capitalists suffer no injustice, for we warned them of what was coming."

They say they are justified in suppressing liquor shops because they are nuisances. Nuisances may be defined to be things which are injurious to health, or offensive to the sight, smell or hearing, of the public. Nuisances are repellant, but the complaint made against saloons by Prohibitionists themselves is that they are so attractive as to render men only too willing to resort thither voluntarily. They say there is no use trying to reform the drinking habits of some people if there is a saloon at hand, for they can't resist the temptation to to resort thither. To compare saloons to nuisances, then, is false analogy; and even if it were not, justice requires that nuisances such as glue factories, boiler shops and other kinds of business which have become established in localities where they become nuisances through increase of population, should not be abated by law without compensation to the proprietors.

They refer to the emancipation of the slaves in the United States without compensation to their owners as a precedent; but the abolition of slavery was a war measure. Slavery was criminal in depriving human beings of their liberty, without any cause on their part; yet the British Government paid \$100,000,000 as compensation to the slave owners of her distant West Indian Colonies, and if emancipation had taken place in the United States during a time of peace thousands of millions of dollars would have been justly paid to the slave owners by way of compensation.

Let the excuse be what it may, the fact remains, that, although it is one of the fundamental duties of the Government to protect every citizen in the enjoyment of his property, and although the Federal Constitution expressly provides that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation," yet hundreds of thousands of people have been deprived of occupations which throughout all previous history had been recognized and protected by law, and hundreds of millions of dollars invested in property have been rendered valueless by Prohibitionist legislation without one dollar of compensation to any one man of that class whose ruin was fully expected as a direct result of the law. Legislatures are undergoing a moral decadence on this question. Liquor merchants are treated as if they were outlaws without legal rights. The State of Ohio, having exacted large sums from the liquor dealers years ago, under authority of her first Scott Act law, which the

Supreme Court declared to be unconstitutional, refused to return the money, or even to enable those who had paid to set off their claims against the further sums imposed by her subsequent liquor laws. Duty called upon her to perform an act of honesty towards her own citizens, but she disobeyed the call, although if the same question had been litigated by one citizen against another in her courts that simple act of justice would have been compelled. Towards the legislature the eyes of every intelligent citizen are turned, and, therefore, if for no other reason, it should set an example of rectitude. If dishonesty prevails there what is to be looked for among the people? Can proper obedience to laws be expected from the governed when the governing powers whence those laws emanate is itself not in accord with and even violates, the principles which good laws inculcate? The extent to which such legislation is responsible for the loose ideas of right and wrong, which are only too prevalent, the Allwise alone knows; but that it has a disastrous effect no reasonable man can doubt.

Hand in hand with the plain devil who causes such conduct goes the embodiment of

SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS

with which Prohibitionists are imbued. This self-righteousness was noticed by Judge Bramwell in his book on drink, as follows:

"There are some opinions entertained as honestly, as strongly, and after as much thought as the opinions to the contrary, but which, nevertheless, are put forth in an apologetic way, as if those who hold them were doing wrong and knew it. This apologetic style exists in some cases where the opinion entertained is righteous, just, moral, and in conformity with the practice of all mankind. It exists where those who hold the contrary opinion say and are permitted by their opponents to say, 'We are the righteous, the good, the virtuous, and you are the wicked, the bad, the vicious.' This is what the total abstainers say of themselves and of those who don't agree with them. As I think my opinion is as good and virtuous as theirs, with the additional merit of being right, I shall state, without asking pardon for it or for myself, that drink is a good thing, and that the world would act very foolishly to give it up, for by the pleasure and utility of its use it does an immense deal more good than harm."

Archdeacon Farrar took exception to the statement that teetotalers say of themselves, "We are the righteous, the good, the virtuous, and you are the wicked, the bad, the vicious," saying:

"I would respectfully ask Lord Bramwell who has ever said

this? Can he out of reams of temperance literature adduce a single sentence to that effect? I have never heard anything even distantly approaching such a statement. There is not a single reasonable advocate of temperance who would not regard so pharisaic and uncharitable a judgment as perfectly detestable."

But hold, Mr. Faraar! You are evidently behind the times. Come to America during a so-called "Temperance campaign," and you may then listen to Sunday sermons in which Prohibitionists are styled "the Christians and true moralists," and their opponents are referred to as "ignorant, mercenary, apostles of Bacchus, sellers of their birthright, sinners, sots, anti-Christians, devilish," etc. Many Prohibitionists, relying on this self-righteousness, glory in the reputation they have for powers of abuse towards their opponents. A clergyman has been heard to begin an oration in favor of Prohibition with the statement that he would give Gospel to the audience, and then follow up that promise with such intemperance of language and of manner, and by making such misstatements as to justify the remark that if such principles are Gospel the God of that Gospel is the devil, and the orator is his prophet.

LEGALIZED TYRANNY.

The object of criminal laws is to deter the evil-disposed, and it is the care of the qualified legislator to adapt the punishment to the nature of the offence. The object of Prohibition is not only to deter from the drinking of intoxicating liquors, but to put an end to it, and therefore the penalties are out of all proportion to the nature of the offence. Justice, tempered with mercy, is not a quality of Prohibitory laws. Years ago General Dow stated that the traffic must be declared to be felonious* before it could be stamped out, and in every stronghold of Prohibition, from Maine to Kansas, they seem to approximate to that position. In Maine, at almost every sitting of the Legislature during the past 50 years, the stringency of the law has been increased, until the severity of the penalties makes human nature recoil from aiding in the infliction of them, and thus the venom of the Act carries its own antidote:

*Like Jack Cade, though with a different object in view, Mr. Dow "would have made it felony to drink small beer." The ludicrous idea of the poet tends toward becoming a grim reality. When that pass will have arrived, the crisis will be upon us. Only let some man be executed for the heinous offence of selling a glass of lager beer, and it will then be for the long-suffering many to agitate for the suppression of the Prohibitionists.

In Kansas a physician is not allowed to prescribe wine for his prostrated patient unless he knows, not that, according to his judgment, it was advisable to do so, but that, as a matter of fact, such prescription is necessary; and unless he can prove this on his trial, he is to be found guilty of a misdemeanor and punished by a fine of from \$100 to \$500, coupled with imprisonment in the county jail for a term of not less than ten and not more than ninety days.

Kansas has been "educated up" to the point, not only of carrying on a social war of one class of its citizens against another class, but, by means of legislative brute force, of driving its own officers into the advanced positions of the battle-field, for the same Act provides that all sheriffs and constables, marshals, police judges and police officers, having any notice or knowledge of any violations of the Act, must notify the county attorney of the fact and furnish the names of all witnesses, within their knowledge, by whom the violation can be proven; and in default of such notice to the crown attorney the penalty is forfeiture of office, coupled with a fine of from \$100 to \$10,000. And if any county attorney be notified, it shall be his duty diligently to prosecute any and all persons so violating the Act, and if he shall fail, neglect or refuse, faithfully to perform such duty, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction, shall forfeit his office, be fined \$10 and upwards, and be imprisoned in the county jail from ten to ninety days.

The severity of the penalties imposed upon the liquor sellers by this Kansas Act can be judged of by the sentence of an offending druggist's clerk to a fine of \$20,800, coupled with imprisonment for the term of seventeen years and four months in the common jail!

The otherwise excellent license law of Ontario violates our sense of right by declaring the buying and selling of intoxicants after certain hours to be criminal,* and that if any municipal officer is the offender he shall forfeit his office as if he were a felon of deepest dye, as the mayor of the capital city of the Dominion did recently. It shows the strange mental warp produced by prohibition that no outcry has caused the erasure from the statute-book of the foul blot which authorizes such an atrocity to be called justice.

That law merely expresses the spirit which actuates Prohibition-

*The purchase and sale are perfectly legal to within one minute of a certain hour, but when the clock strikes, presto! that act has become a crime. Such restrictions as to hours of selling were injurious in Wales. See *Fortnightly Review* for August, 1884, p. 211.

ists. In Iowa they assailed the majesty of the law by trying to degrade its highest administrators. An attempt was made by a Temperance Alliance, at the instigation of a clergyman, to remove a judge by impeachment, without stating any more specific act of malfeasance than that "he has shamefully refused to apply the law directing the abatement of grog-shops as nuisances." The judge defended himself from this attack on his judicial integrity, saying:

"No case was ever presented to me, and probably never to a court in this district at any time, by any grand jury or any other body, power or person that sought to execute the abatement provision of this statute, or upon which a judgment of abatement could, under any circumstances, have been rendered."

Can justice poise impartial scales where the Legislature and a portion of the people try to distort the mental vision of the judges and executive officers by threats of impeachment, of fines, imprisonment and forfeiture of office?

MISREPRESENTATIONS.

Mr. Dow claimed that:—

"The people of Maine save at least \$12,000,000 in direct cost and an equal amount in indirect cost, making \$24,000,000, saved annually which but for Prohibition would be spent and lost in strong drink. This large saving is seen everywhere throughout the State in the vastly improved condition of the people and in the healthy and vigorous expansion of all our industries."

As this saving should have existed during the last 50 years it should now amount to \$1,200,000,000, and this sum being divided among the 694,366 inhabitants of that State every man, woman and child, should possess money or its equivalent to the amount of \$1,728, making more by \$8,640, for every family of five persons than such family would have owned but for the Maine law.

As was shown in the first issue of this pamphlet, Maine had at that time less wealth than any license State of New England had.

In Kansas the Prohibitionists "as the price of their votes" obtained signatures from the Governor of that State and other elective officers certifying to the correctness of a statement that Prohibition had increased the population of the State, had done away with the saloons lowered the taxes, abated drunkenness, crime, &c. That statement so authenticated was then heralded throughout the United States and Canada for the purpose of aiding the cause of Prohibition, but was found by the Canadian Commissioners to have been made on the principle of doing evil that good may come.*

*See last volume, pages 306 to 316.

EXAGGERATIONS.

Having met Prohibitionists on their own ground, by assuming that the use of intoxicating liquors is the evil they represent it to be, it has now been shown that the remedy they advocate is ineffectual, even where it has been tried under the most favorable conditions. But it may well be claimed that the evil they fight is greatly exaggerated by them.

Johnson said to Boswell, that to frighten people about the effects of drunkenness would make a deeper impression upon them than reasoning with them would, and prohibitionists act in the belief of the same fact. One of their themes is the adulteration of liquors, and they give it to be understood that even the simplest and cheapest kinds contain poison-ingredients. The National Temperance Society once published a pamphlet called "The History and Mystery of a Glass of Ale," in which it was stated that brewers use strychnia, tobacco, copperas, coculus, aloes, quassia, bicarbonate of soda, bicarbonate of lime, and other poisons and drugs in making beer. It is an answer to this charge to say that the State Board of Health of New York, under authority of law, caused 476 samples of malt liquors to be analyzed during the year 1885, and found all of them to be pure and free from any deleterious substances whatever.

Exaggerations constitute the greater part of the building materials with which the Prohibitionists work. They say that in Canada 3,000 deaths per year are caused by alcoholism ; one twentieth part of that number is nearer the actual fact.

What then is the

EXTENT OF THE TRAFFIC.

The following table taken from the *London Times* shows the average yearly consumption of spirituous liquors per capita of population in various countries in litres, the litre being a little more than a quart :

	SPIRITS. Litres.	WINES. Litres.	BEER. Litres.
Canada	3.08	0.29	8.50
Norway	3.90	1.00	15.30
United States	4.79	2.64	31.30
Great Britain and Ireland.....	5.39	2.59	143.90
Austria-Hungary.....	5.76	22.40	28.40
France	7.28	119.20	21.10
Russia.....	8.08	Unknown	4.65
Sweden.....	8.44	0.36	11.00
German Zollverein.....	3.60	6.90	65.00

Belguim.....	9.20	3.70	199.20
Switzerland.....	15.30	55.00	37.50
Netherlands	9.87	2.58	27.00
Denmark	18.90	1.00	33.30

Now, if we are in such a bad way through liquor drinking that Prohibitionists think it is their duty to rescue us by force in spite of ourselves, what is to become of the Swiss, who drink about five times as much spirits per inhabitant as we drink, about two hundred times as much wine, and four times as much beer also, and yet are free from any attempt at coercive restraint? Are we so much less qualified to enjoy liberty of choice than they are? Then look at the Danes and Belgians. Those peoples, according to Prohibitionist theories, should be the most criminal, the most afflicted with insanity and pauperism, the most degenerate and demoralized, of any people on earth, yet statistics do not verify those theories. We said most, but we must except the Scotch,* for the Scotch enjoy the bad pre-eminence of being the greatest of whiskey drinkers. The English drink beer, but the Scotch drink fiery usquebaugh, a liquor which their ancestors, for hundreds of years past, drank; but that people have not as yet shown any noticeable signs of physical or of mental degeneracy. On the contrary, they continue to be noted for their industry, frugality, self-reliance, intelligence and freedom from crime, and for their physical and mental powers. Compare with them the Italians, the Spaniards or the Portuguese, who are, and whose ancestors for many centuries past continuously were, very temperate, and it will be found that, besides their temperance, those Italians, Spaniards and Portuguese possess but few qualities to render them worthy of comparison with the Scotch.

THE CANADIAN COMMISSIONER'S REPORT.

In the year 1892, the Dominion Government appointed five well qualified Commissioners, two of whom were Prohibitionists, to investigate and report as to the results of Prohibition. These Commissioners made exhaustive inquiries extending over a period of three years and filled volumes of evidence. They personally visited Prohibition States in order to know the facts, and they found that through-

*According to Prohibitionists, Scotland should be a den full of criminals, of insane people, of indolent paupers, and of wretchedness. Do the facts bear out their theory? If not, are we so much less worthy of self-control than the Scotch, that law should regulate us in what we are to drink?

out the United States Prohibition is a dying cause, elections on the question of Prohibition having been held in 13 States during the years 1887 and 1888, out of which number eleven States gave large majorities adverse to the Act.*

The Commissioners say :—

“The first great reason for the reaction is non-enforcement. ‘Where is Prohibition enforced’ has been asked by us repeatedly and the answer is, ‘not in any place efficiently.’ The whole trend of the evidence proves only this, that Prohibition prohibits where no one wants intoxicating liquors, but nowhere else.”†

Not one city has ever yet been found in which prohibition ever became and continued to be successful. The proposed referendum law aims only at destroying the saloons, but does not attempt to prevent the bringing of liquors to our homes from beyond the province, and as strong liquors are more easily kept good and more readily handled than malt liquors are the principal effect of that law would be “to rob the poor man of his beer” and let him drink whiskey instead.

LICENSES TO SELL.

To show the facilities for getting intoxicating liquors in all the Prohibition States as compared with those in the Province of Ontario the following figures are given. The population of the several States is taken from the federal census for 1900, but with the exception of Maine the local liquor agencies, of which there is one in every town, are not taken into account; the licenses are for 1901. For Ontario the population and the number of licenses are for the year 1900 :

State.	Licenses.	Population.	Proportion to Population.
Maine	1,504	694,366	1 to 462 persons.
Kansas	5,328	1,469,496	1 to 276 “
North Dakota	661	319,040	1 to 480 “
Iowa	5,528	2,251,829	1 to 409 “
Vermont	622	343,641	1 to 520 “
New Hampshire	1,650	411,588	1 to 250 “
Ontario	3,008	2,167,978	1 to 722 “

These figures show that in the proportion of licenses to population Ontario has more restriction than any one of the Prohibition States

*The results of those elections so paralyzed the Prohibitionists that they have never since ventured to try a popular vote in any State; just as the way the Scott Act was swept out of Ontario has so paralyzed its advocates that this law is now a dead letter among our statutes.

†See Commissioner's Report last volume, pages 485 and 486.

has, and beyond doubt the contrast is still greater in respect of the number of unlicensed grogeries.

In Kansas the number of licenses issued for the year 1881, being the year before Prohibition came into force, was 1,894; for the year 1882, being the first year of Prohibition, the number fell to 1,787; for the year 1883 the number arose to 2,150, and has increased from year to year until the number is as above stated 5,328.

In 1894 Iowa, without repealing the prohibitory law, passed another law, which is virtually a high license and local option law. Is it not a brazen fraud to claim that prohibition is successful?

COST OF PROHIBITION.

If we were to adopt the Referendum law the loss to the Dominion, to the Provinces and to the Municipalities would be as follows:

1. The municipalities would lose about \$1,000,000 per year, now received by them as their share of the license fees.

2. The Provincial Government would lose \$304,676* annually, being its share of license fees.

3. The amount derived annually by the Dominion Government from the excise and customs on liquors is nearly \$10,000,000.† Of this sum our province contributes at least \$3,500,000, and under prohibition this sum would shrink by the sum of \$1,000,000 per year.

4. To act honestly our government must compensate those whose property and occupations would suffer thereby, and possibly \$30,000,000 should be expended in that way.

5. Prohibitionists admit that their law is of no use unless enforced, but to enforce it against smuggling along our very extended frontier‡ and against illicit sales and illicit manufacture would require 10,000 detectives, and these at \$1 per day for each would cost \$3,650,000 annually.

RESUME OF ABOVE.

1. Loss to municipalities	\$1,000,000
2. Loss to province	304,676
3. Ontario's share of the Dominion loss.....	300,000
4. Interest on \$30,000,000 at 3½ per cent., Ontario.....	1,000,000
5. Detectives' salaries.....	3,500,000

\$6,104,676

*This amount was received by the provinces for the year ending 30th June, 1901.

†The amount was \$9,809,934 for the year 1901.

‡Year before last it cost the Dominion Government \$37,531.55 in trying to prevent the smuggling of liquors from the two small French islands, St. Pierre and Miquelon, near Newfoundland.

Making an additional load of \$14 annually upon every family of five persons in Ontario. How would Prohibitionists meet this load? Justice would require that they should do so out of their own pockets.

But for past expenditure by our province we have assets to show in the shape of indispensable public works. Now what assets would Prohibition have to show? The answer to this question is that the assets of Prohibition would be increased drunkenness, corruption and crime. It may be asserted then that our prohibitionists, both clerical and lay, are the most dangerous anarchists that ever threatened to destroy the welfare of a people.

QUESTIONS FOR PROHIBITIONISTS.

Do they know :—

1. That the Sciences of Physiology, Jurisprudence and Ethics are against their law.
2. That Prohibition has uniformly not only failed to prohibit but has fostered the principles of Anarchy.
3. That the people of Ontario being very temperate, liquor drinking among us is not an evil but a benefit.
4. That in our Plebiscite of 1898, every city, that is every centre of intelligence, gave large majorities against Prohibition.
5. That the proposed law would merely prohibit saloons, but would allow every person to bring all kinds of intoxicants to his home from beyond the province.
6. That this law would be less efficient and more pernicious than the Scott Act and would speedily be repealed.
7. That the carrying of the Act would illustrate Edmund Burke's strong objection to democracies that they allow the ignorant to govern the intelligent.

PROPER RULE OF CONDUCT.

Est modus in rebus sunt certi denique fines quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum. ("There is a rule for conduct; there are, in fact, certain boundaries, on this side and on that, of which we go astray.")

Such was the golden mean of the ancients. And if the same rule had always been practiced by us respecting the use of fermented and spirituous liquors it would have been much better for the welfare of our citizens. Comparatively few among us use liquor to excess. The men composing that few are sufficiently punished by and for that excess. They employ no coercive means to compel others to do as they do. On

the contrary their example deters others; yet the error of this few is made the pretext by Prohibitionists for going to the other extreme, and applying coercive legislation, not only to remedy that error, but to commit the greater error of trying to restrain the moderate drinker also from all use of intoxicating liquors, so that we see this strange anomaly that no nation is subjected to such impertinent tyranny as we are on a question of diet wherein every man ought to be his own best judge, and yet we claim to be the most liberty-loving people on earth. The Czar of Russia, with all his despotism, would not dare to issue a ukase embodying such provisions as our Prohibitory liquor laws do, nor would he attempt to do so on a subject which is so well known by statesmen to be beyond the proper sphere of legislation.

Legislative attempts to suppress the drinking of intoxicating liquors are wrong, because such attempts withdraw attention from the duty of home education, which is the best source of temperance reform. As the Spartans taught the youth of their country the virtue of moderation by pointing out the degrading consequences of the excessive indulgence in liquor, so should children in our time be taught self-control, self-reliance and self-respect, and thus by facing and overcoming the difficulties they meet, instead of taking refuge in flight, they would become qualified to go out into the world and fight the battle of life without needing grandmotherly legislation for their protection.

SUMMARY OF ERRORS.

We conclude with the following brief statements :—

1. Prohibitionists claim that their law must be successful where ever the moral sentiment of a large majority of the people is in its favor; but even there the self-imposed duty of seeing to its enforcement eventually becomes repulsive, spasmodic, evanescent and fruitless as against the natural inclination of men for such stimulants as intoxicating liquors are.

2. They are not aware of the good effect a proper use of intoxicating liquors has upon the system. They fail to discern the distinction between use and abuse, and therefore they suffer, and by moral and physical thuggism cause thousands to suffer, through non-indulgence in such use.

3. In so far as liquor drinking is an evil, they apply a remedy which the Allwise does not intend should be the proper remedy for that evil.

4. By transforming moral duties into legal duties they disobey the Divine behest that we should not render unto Cæsar the things that are God's.

5. They destroy the springs of moral action by ruling men from without, instead of encouraging them to rule themselves aright from within.

6. They declare certain acts to be crimes which natural justice and common sense say are not crimes.

7. The tyranny of their laws and violence of their methods prejudice people against Christianity and temperance, and tend to destroy that respect for all law, without which government itself becomes impossible.

8. For the sword of the spirit they substitute the baton of the constable, and like all fanatics when in a minority they are ceaseless suppliants, when on an equality they are turbulent agitators, and when in a majority they are relentless tyrants.

9. They try to suppress the saloons, and thereby incite to the introduction of liquor into private houses, and to the setting up of club houses for the rich, and low grogeries for the poor.

10. They cause a decrease in the use of mild liquors, but an increase in the use of strong liquors.

11. They are at war against the natural rights of man, and try to deprive us of one of the means of enjoying life.

12. They interfere with the rights of the worthy many in a vain attempt to benefit a worthless few.

13. They encourage spies and informers and clothe certain officers with the powers of depotism.

14. They favor class legislation, by affecting the legal rights of the poor more than those of the rich.

15. They are dishonest in depriving many of their fellow-citizens of their occupations, and in depreciating the value of their property without compensation.

16. They destroy the revenues which had been derived from the license fees, and they increase the expenses of administering justice.

17. They cause an increase in taxes and diminish the means of paying them.

18. Instead of that harmonious application of all our energies to useful industries, which is essential to material progress, they cause and they indulge in a vast expenditure of time, labor and money to the sowing of bitter social discord.

19. They foster political corruption by opposing their outspoken opponents, however worthy they may be, and by supporting unprincipled politicians, who, for the mere purpose of such support, profess to be in accord with their views.

20. They say to candidates for election. If you want to be successful fall down and worship Prohibition, and then they try to defeat those who despise the fetich god of their idolatry, and hence by subordinating every political question to their one object, they form a pernicious excrescence upon the body politic.

21. Their aim, if successful, would involve loss to that important class which is composed of our farmers by destroying to a large extent the home market for barley, rye, hops, corn, and other cereals, and also thereby interfering with the rotation of crops, and by lowering the price of certain fruits which are used in the manufacture of stimulants.

22. They aim at ruining all the manufactures of fermented and spirituous liquors by closing their breweries and distilleries and depriving them and their workmen of their occupations.

23. They aim at injuring our liquor merchants by depriving them of an extensive trade, depreciating the value of their property, destroying the occupation of thousands who are now engaged in the traffic, killing our growing export trade in liquors, and calling into existence a smuggling import trade, thereby making foreigners rejoice at our folly in spending enormous sums to enforce a law which would benefit them while it would injure us.

24. Prohibition is a foul weed which is grounded in ignorance and fostered by falsehoods.

25. Under banners with the pretentious legend, "For God and Home and Native Land," and supported by religion (so-called) we see hosts of fanatics laboring to subvert the moral economy of God, to destroy the functions of home education, to inflict upon us immense financial losses, and foster espionage, social hypocrisy, dishonesty, corruption, unchristian bitterness, crime and anarchy.

